

---

***A Socioeconomic Profile of Recreationists  
at Public Outdoor Recreation  
Sites in Coastal Areas: Volume 1***

---

Vernon R. Leeworthy and Norman F. Meade

August 1989



---

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration



HT392  
.S635  
1989  
v.1

## Coastal and Ocean Resource Economics Program

The Coastal and Ocean Resource Economics Program is an evolving set of activities to develop Nationwide data bases, products and analytical capabilities for conducting economic assessments of activities that directly affect or are affected by the health of the nation's coastal and oceanic resources. The program is conducted by the Strategic Assessments Branch (SAB) of NOAA's Office of Oceanography and Marine Assessments. It's major program elements are described below. Since 1985, the program has also co-sponsored a set of annual workshops with the Environmental Protection Agency on natural resource and environmental economics to support it's major program elements.

**Natural Resource Economic Damage Assessments.** Increased public concern over oil and hazardous substances spills and waste sites has led to the development of natural resource economic damage assessment methods and their implementation in support of litigation against the responsible parties. Beginning with the AMOCO CADIZ oil spill in 1978, SAB has been an active participant in this rapidly developing field of applied natural resource economics (see Measuring the Social Costs of Oil Spills: The Amoco Cadiz Study) . In addition to carrying out several previous marine resource damage assessments in support of litigation, SAB is currently helping to design and implement the governments claim for natural resource damage in the EXXON VALDEZ case.

**Inventory and Value of Coastal Recreation.** Because outdoor recreation has been identified as the single largest category of benefit from the improvements in water quality, SAB began to develop a program to inventory and value coastal recreation. The first product of this program was a data base and report "Public Expenditures on Outdoor Recreation in the Coastal Areas of the U.S.A. (1986)" This led to development of an inventory all publicly owned and/or managed recreation areas and facilities in the Nation's coastal areas. Summaries for 21 states and 25 groups of estuaries, by county and level of government, are available in a recently published atlas titled "National Estuarine Inventory, Data Atlas: Public Recreation Facilities in Coastal Areas (1988)." A complementary inventory of all privately owned and managed recreation facilities is also being developed through a cooperative agreement between NOAA and the U.S. Forest Service. Plans are to complete this inventory, Coastal Recreation Inventory, in 1991.

**Public Area Recreation Visitors Survey (PARVS).** PARVS is an ongoing intergovernmental cooperative research project involving seven federal and twelve state agencies. The survey was designed to provide data needed to develop highly credible and broadly comparable estimates of the economic importance of providing recreational opportunities on public lands. PARVS also enables development of detailed information about recreation uses and users and can provide estimates of the direct monetary value derived by users of public recreation areas. User values are critical to analyses of conflicts and trade-offs between recreation and other resource uses. In 1987, SAB initiated the effort to collect data at coastal recreation sites. To date, more than 12,000 interviews have been conducted at forty public outdoor recreation sites in the coastal areas of the U.S.A.


For more information on NOAA's Coastal and Oceanic Resource Economics Program, write to:

Vernon R. Leeworthy  
Strategic Environmental Assessments Division, N/ORCA1  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
1305 East-West Highway, 9th Floor  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
(301) 713-3000

# A Socioeconomic Profile of Recreationists at Public Outdoor Recreation Sites in Coastal Areas: Volume 1

Vernon R. Leeworthy and Norman F. Meade

August, 1989



National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
Office of Oceanography and Marine Assessment  
Ocean Assessments Division  
Strategic Assessment Branch  
6001 Executive Blvd., Rm. 220  
Rockville, MD 20852  
LIBRARY  
NOAA/CCEH  
1990 HOBSON AVE.  
CHAS. SC 29408-2623

ES 19 1986

## Contents

	Page
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Survey Design .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Profile of Visitors .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Type and Extent of Activities .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Spending by Visitors .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Willingness-to-Pay .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>On-going and Future Activities .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Footnotes .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Figures and Tables .....</b>	<b>9</b>

### Figures

1. Recreation Sites Surveyed During the Summer 1987 .....	10
2. U.S. Bureau of the Census Regions and Divisions of the United States .....	11
3. Comparison of Family Income Distributions for In-State and Out-of-State Visitors to Myrtle Beach State Park, South Carolina .....	12

### Tables

1. Managing Agencies and Number of Completed Interviews for the 1987 PARVS Coastal Sites .....	13
2. Distribution of Surveyed Visitors by Census Division or Country of Residence .....	14
3. Distribution of In-State and Out-of-State Visitors, by Site .....	15
4. Average Distance Traveled to the Ten Coastal Sites .....	16
5. Age Distribution of All Visitors by Site, Compared to the States and the U.S.A. .....	17
6. Gender and Racial Composition of All Visitors by Site, Compared to the States and the U.S.A. .....	18
7. Distribution of All Visitors by Highest Education Level Attained, by Site .....	19
8. Distribution of Family Income of Visitors, by Site, Compared to the States and the U.S.A. e .....	20
9. Distribution of Visitors by Group Size .....	21
10. Distribution of Visitors by Group Type .....	22
11. Average Annual Number of Days on Site and Trips to the Site, and the Average Length of Stay on Site for the Interview Trip .....	23
12a. Ranking of the Top Ten Main Activities of Visitors Age 16 and Older .....	24

## **Contents (continued)**

Tables (continued)	Page
12b. Ranking of the Top 15 Activities of Visitors of All Ages .....	25
13. Average Daily On-site Fees and Trip Expenditures Per Person Interviewed .....	26
14. Maximum Willingness-to-Pay for an Annual Vehicle Pass for the Interview Site Versus Any Site the Agency Manages .....	27
15. Willingness-to-Pay Randomly Assigned Dollar Amounts - On-site Survey .....	28
16. Willingness-to-Pay for Vehicle Pass to Site: Randomly Assigned Dollar Amounts - Mailback Survey .....	29
17. Satisfaction Ratings on a Scale from 1 to 10 .....	30
<b>Appendix A: Site Profiles .....</b>	<b>31</b>

(List of Coastal and Ocean Resource Economics Program Publications on inside back cover.)

## Introduction

This report summarizes information collected during the summer of 1987 through surveys conducted at seven state and three federally managed parks in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Mississippi. Over 2,400 on-site (intercept) interviews were completed from June 20, 1987 to August 31, 1987 at the ten sites. An additional 821 mailback questionnaires have been completed.

Tabular summaries of the following information are contained in this report: 1) socio-demographic profiles of users; 2) type and extent of recreation activities engaged in; 3) types and amount of expenditures on recreation activities; and 4) willingness-to-pay for park access and satisfaction ratings. Also, included are detailed profiles of the ten sites from the NOAA Inventory of Public Recreation Areas and Facilities in Coastal Areas. This information is intended for recreation planners and managers and business marketing agents that require simple summary information on the uses and users of coastal recreation sites.

Future reports will detail estimates of activity and site specific user values currently being developed using travel cost demand models and contingent valuation techniques.

## Survey Design

**Survey Questionnaires.** Data collection employed two survey questionnaires: 1) an intercept (completed using a face-to-face interview) and 2) a mailback. The intercept, or on-site questionnaire, obtains information on the users and uses of the site and other information necessary for recreational demand modeling. The mailback questionnaire is used in a follow-up survey to obtain detailed information on trip-related expenditures, willingness-to-pay for park access using contingent valuation questions, and user satisfaction ratings on a 1 to 10 scale. The mailback survey also provides information necessary for estimating the importance of parks to local and regional economies.

**Site Selection.** Sites were selected from the NOAA Inventory of Public Recreation Areas and Facilities in Coastal Areas based on several criteria: 1) they had to be adjacent to tidal or ocean waters; 2) the sites had to have at least 100,000 visitors annually; 3) they had to have camping facilities to house interviewers; 4) the majority of site usage had to take place during the summer season; 5) the sites had to be geographically dispersed; and 6) the managing agencies had to agree to provide on-site logistical support for the interview-

ers. Figure 1 shows the geographic dispersion of the ten PARVS coastal sites, while Table 1 lists the managing agencies for each site. Detailed profiles of the sites are included in Appendix A.

**Number of Responses.** Overall, 2,441 interviews were completed on-site (intercept survey) while 821 follow-up mailbacks were received, for an overall mailback response rate of about 34 percent (Table 1). Each site was targeted for at least 300 on-site interviews, however, in only four cases was this achieved. Bad weather, low visitation and incomplete surveys (i.e., interviews discontinued before completion) explain the less than targeted number of on-site interviews. No explanation is readily available for the low mailback response rate at several sites.

**Sampling.** The number of interviews at each site were stratified across various access points and time of week (weekdays versus weekends) to give proper representation of the various recreation activities available at each site. The sampling frame was a vehicle, while the sampling unit was an individual. One person was randomly selected from each randomly selected vehicle. Only those age 16 and older were interviewed. Demographic information was collected on up to seven people traveling in the vehicle. The number of people in each vehicle that participated in each activity was also collected. The mailback survey was sent to the person that was interviewed unless someone else paid for their expenses. In these cases, the person that paid expenses was identified and that person received the mailback portion of the survey.

## Profile of Visitors

Information on the users of marine recreational resources, such as where they come from, how far they travel to get there, their age distribution, gender and racial composition, education levels, family incomes, group type and size are all important for assessing current and future demands for park services. These data are also used in economic impact studies to estimate the demand for other goods and services from local areas surrounding the parks.

**Market Area.** Home zip code, state, and county was obtained from each person interviewed on-site. This information has been aggregated into Bureau of the Census "census divisions" to show the market areas for each of the ten sites (Table 2). Each of the census divisions is made up of a group of states and can be further aggregated into four census regions (Figure 2).

As expected, the census division in which the site is located accounts for the majority of visitors. The nine

sites located in the South Atlantic receive from 64 percent (Cape Hatteras National Seashore) to 91 percent (Ft. McAllister State Historic Park) of their visitors from within the census division. Gulf Islands National Seashore, which is located in two census divisions (South Atlantic and East South Central) derives only about 51 percent of its visitors from within these two divisions. However, when the adjacent West South Central division is included, over 76 percent of the visitors are accounted for.

For assessing local and regional economic impacts, in terms of sales, employment, income, tax revenues, and the cost of local services, it sometimes is important to know more detail about travel patterns than Table 2 provides. Table 3 shows the in-state and out-of-state distribution of visitors for all ten sites. Two of the three National Seashores (Cape Hatteras and Gulf Islands) draw most of their visitors from outside the states where they are located. These sites are important to their states' economies because they stimulate an influx of expenditures from non-residents.

**Distances Traveled to the Sites.** For modeling recreational demand, it is important to know how far visitors travel to the sites. From this information, a proxy for the willingness-to-pay, or price, of site access is constructed. This is generally referred to as the "travel cost method." See Bockstael et. al. (1986) for a review of this popular method for modeling recreation demand.

One of the many issues debated in travel cost modeling is the proper specification of distance traveled. For single purpose, single-destination trips, total distance to the site, or total round trip mileage, is appropriate. However, when multiple purpose or multiple destination trips are involved, total distance traveled to the site may overstate the cost of access. Information was obtained in the PARVS interviews to determine the purpose of the trip and if there were destinations other than the park visited. Additional information was also obtained on the primary purpose and destination of the trip. If other destinations were involved, the destination previous to the park where the respondents were interviewed was obtained. From this information, three distance variables were constructed (Table 4).

The first measure is unadjusted and represents the distance from where the trip was started to the park. On average, visitors traveled over 340 miles one-way to the sites. The second measure is adjusted for those that visited multiple sites and for whom the park where interviewed was not the primary destination of the trip. For individuals in this category, the distance from the site visited previously to the site where the interview took place was calculated. On average, for all ten

sites, this yielded a one-way travel distance of only about 240 miles, or about 30 percent less than the unadjusted measure. No adjustments were made to the distances traveled for visitors to Carolina Beach State Park, Myrtle Beach State Park and only an insignificant adjustment was made to visitors of Ft. McAllister State Historic Park because these sites were either the only destination or they were the primary destination of the trip.

The second measure received another adjustment for about two percent of the sample: those that visited the sites while enroute home from a previously visited site. In these cases, the distance from the most efficient path home to the site where interviewed was calculated (see footnote 3, Table 4). This adjustment made only a small difference in the averages reported in Table 4. However, in individual cases the adjustments could be quite large. It may, therefore, be an important element for improving the results of travel cost modeling. This possibility will be tested in future research.

**Age Distribution of All Visitors.** Table 5 shows the age distribution of all visitors to the ten sites. The actual age of up to seven people traveling in each vehicle interviewed was obtained. Eight age groups were formed to correspond to those used by the Bureau of the Census. This allows for the comparison of age distributions across the relevant market areas (i.e., states where the sites are located). Differences between the age distributions in the general market area for each site and the age distributions of visitors of each site suggest that age may be an important factor in explaining park visitation.

**Gender and Racial Composition of All Visitors.** The only significant differences in the male - female distribution between visitors at the 10 parks and the states where the parks are located, or the U.S. as a whole, was at Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Myrtle Beach State Park (Table 6). This suggests that gender may not be an important factor in explaining park visitation. Racial composition, on the other hand, appears to be a significant factor. The percentage of visitors that are white is significantly higher than for the general population in any of the defined market areas.

**Education Levels of All Visitors.** Education level may be an important factor in explaining park visitation, however, the manner in which the data is reported by the Bureau of the Census does not lend itself to direct comparison with defined market areas. It may be possible with further work on Bureau of the Census data tapes to compile comparable categories. Another important use of this information is in park planning, to the extent that park activities are education dependent. Guided tours of archaeological or

historical sites or on nature trails where interpretive services are important examples. Table 7 summarizes the education levels of all visitors to the parks.

**Family Income of Visitors.** Many studies of recreational behavior have found income to be an important factor in explaining both recreational participation and avidity. Table 8 shows the distribution of family incomes of all visitors aggregated into six groups that correspond to those categories reported by the Bureau of the Census. The survey actually collects income using 12 income categories. The family incomes of park visitors at all ten sites are significantly higher than the U.S. population as a whole. This lends further support for the hypothesis that income is an important determinant of park visitation.

Because income may also be a determinant of the level of expenditures and that tourists or out-of-state visitors generally have higher expenditures than in-state visitors, the differences in mean incomes between in-state and out-of-state visitors was tested. A significant difference was found at only one park, Myrtle Beach State Park in South Carolina. Figure 3 shows a comparison of the income distribution for in-state and out-of-state visitors to Myrtle Beach State Park.

**Group Size and Type.** The average group size across all sites consisted of five people, with a high of 7.44 at Skidaway Island State Park and a low of 3.37 at Carolina Beach State Park (Table 9). In addition, over 50 percent of all groups in the entire sample were of three or more people. The majority of all groups were family based (Table 10). These findings are significant. Schomaker and Morck (1986), in a study of group composition in advertisements for recreationally related products and services, found that family groups and groups larger than two persons were underrepresented when compared to the results of the National Recreation Survey (1977). Family groups appeared in only five percent of the ads, with an average group size of only 2.2.

Group type may also be important to park managers in addressing the issue of imposing site fees. McCurdy (1970, 1985) found that family groups, as opposed to single individuals, couples, or groups of friends most readily accepted site fees. Referendum-type contingent valuation questions on site fees, which will be discussed below, are asked as part of the PARVS survey. Thus, the capability exists to further test this proposition.

## Type and Extent of Activities

**Recreational Usage.** In recreational demand modeling, the two most important pieces of information are a proxy for price and a measure of quantity demanded. Recreational usage information can provide information necessary to obtain both these measures. For example, in many studies the number of trips to the site represent the quantity demanded, while on-site time is used as an input in calculating a portion of the cost of the trip (e.g. total on-site plus travel time multiplied by the value of time). Both the proxy for prices and the measure of quantity demanded have varied across studies depending on the purpose and scope of the analyses. Table 11 reports the average number of trips to the site over the past 12 months, the average length of stay per trip (e.g. the number of days spent on-site during the trip on which the interview was conducted), and the percentage of single day trips. For all ten sites, the average person made 3.5 trips to the site where interviewed, and spent an average of seven days there over the past 12 months. The average length of stay for the interview trip was 4.19 days, while 34.3 percent were single day trips.

There was a good deal of variation in these measures across sites. On average, the visitors to Carolina Beach State Park made the most trips (9.27) and spent the most days on-site (13.29) during the past 12 months, while visitors to Cumberland Island National Seashore made both the fewest trips (1.52) and spent the fewest days (3.83). The average length of stay on the interview trip was greatest at Myrtle Beach State Park and Cape Hatteras National Seashore, at over six days. Huntington Beach State Park and Ft. McAllister State Historic Park had the shortest length of stay, which is consistent with the fact that both these sites had the highest percentage of day-trip visitors.

**Main Activities.** Table 12a reports the ranking of the top ten "main" activities across all ten sites and how each of these activities are ranked for each of the sites. The top ten activities are not ranked on the basis of the greatest number of participants in each activity, but by the percent of visitors, age 16 and older, that responded that a particular activity was their main activity. The greatest percent of visitors at five of the 10 sites said they had no main activity. At Carolina Beach State Park, over 82 percent said they had no main activity. This suggests that modeling park demand on an activity basis using a travel cost model may not be advisable. The reason is that activity-specific travel cost models employ the assumption that one activity provided the main motivation for the trip. This is clearly not true for a large proportion of this sample.

**Activities of All Visitors.** Table 12b reports the ranking of the top 15 activities. Activities are ranked on the basis of the greatest percent of participants from the sample of visitors of all ages. From 2,441 interviews of people 16 and older, there were 8,062 people of all ages for which activity participation was reported. Since the main activity question (Table 12a) was asked only of those aged 16 and older, and the majority of these people responded that they had no main activity, it is not surprising that the top ten activities based on participation is different from the top ten "main" activities. However, seven of the top ten "main activities" were also among the top ten activities participated in by all visitors across all 10 sites.

Participation rate, by activity, varied greatly across sites. "Other Outdoor Swimming" ranked number one in five of the ten sites, but only ranked fourteenth at Fort McAllister State Historic Site and fifteenth at nearby Skidaway Island State Park. Differences in participation rates across sites for Other Outdoor Swimming may reflect different water qualities. It is interesting that at Myrtle Beach State Park, although a majority (56.7%) participated in Other Outdoor Swimming, a greater majority (77.8%) participated in Pool Swimming.

### Spending by Visitors

Studies in the economics of outdoor recreation have utilized expenditures for two purposes: 1) for specifying a proxy for price when modeling the demand for recreation; and 2) for economic impact analysis where the impact of recreational activity is estimated on local and/or regional economies in terms of sales, employment, income, tax revenues etc. It is primarily to the former purpose that NOAA intends to apply the PARVS data.

**Onsite Fees.** Table 13 reports the average daily on-site fees paid per person. This information was obtained from the intercept portion of the survey. On-site fees represent a portion of the total cost of accessing a site and will be used with travel costs in constructing a proxy for price in future demand modeling work. On average, about \$7 per person per day was spent for fees on-site. This varied from a high of over \$17 at Cumberland Island National Seashore to a low of about \$1 at Carolina Beach State Park.

**Trip Expenditures.** Table 13 also reports all trip related expenditures. These expenditures are broken down into three categories: 1) the amount spent while preparing for the trip at home, or upon return from the trip (e.g. film purchased at home in preparation for the trip and film development upon return from the trip); 2) while traveling to and from the site (e.g. expenses for

lodging, food and travel); and 3) while visiting the site or immediate area (e.g. expenses for food, lodging, local travel, on-site fees, fishing bait, souvenirs, etc.). This comprehensive expenditure profile is particularly useful for analyzing the economic impact that visitors to parks have on local and/or regional economies.<sup>1</sup>

On average, a total of \$234 per person was spent on trips to the ten coastal sites. About \$90 per person was spent while at the site or in the immediate area where the site is located, while \$71 was spent preparing for the trip and/or upon return home. About \$73 per person was spent traveling to and from the site.

There are several possible problems with the trip expenditures reported in Table 13. First, they are unweighted for sample response bias. Second, three of the sites had low mailback response rates: Cape Hatteras National Seashore (20%); Carolina Beach State Park (23%); and Ft. McAllister State Historic Park (12%), so there are only small samples from which to derive population estimates. Third, there was inconsistent reporting in the breakdown across the three categories. Some reported lodging expenditures while preparing for the trip or upon return from the trip. Those that may have paid with a credit card may have recorded paying the bill at home instead of paying for a service received in the area where they visited. Fourth, about 32 percent of the sample were on multiple destination trips. It is not clear whether all the expenditures made, while preparing for the trip or upon return home from the trip and while traveling to and from the site, should be considered as attributable to the site where interviewed. Future assessments of economic impact will have to address these problems.

### Willingness-to-Pay

The survey used several direct approaches for measuring the willingness-of-visitors to pay site access fees. Each of these approaches utilize the contingent valuation method (CVM). Four separate questions were asked, one on the intercept questionnaire and three in the mailback survey. Two of the questions on the mailback survey were open-ended in that the maximum dollar amount the individual would pay was asked and that individual simply fills in a dollar amount. This represents the more traditional CVM approach. One question was asked on-site and one on the mailback survey using a relatively new approach which asks for yes or no responses to randomly assigned dollar amounts. This is commonly known as the referendum approach, since each person is simply asked to vote yes or no to the assigned dollar amount. This approach is thought to have several advantages over the open-ended question approach. For example, the referendum approach avoids strategic bias<sup>2</sup>,

and is similar to market transactions where consumers either purchase or do not purchase a product at the given market prices. The main disadvantages of this new approach is that it requires more sophisticated analyses in order to yield answers comparable to the open-ended questions and the methods of analysis are still experimental.

**Open Ended Questions.** Table 14 reports the results of two open-ended CVM questions on the willingness-to-pay site access fees. The first question asked what was the maximum amount the individual would be willing to pay for an annual vehicle pass that would permit access to the site for all persons in the vehicle. The pass would apply to the interview site only and would only cover site admission, not any other fees (i.e., camping). The average for all sites was \$8.30. Three sites have insufficient numbers of returned mailbacks to give reliable statistical results, but are reported since they are not statistically different from the values at other sites.

The second open-ended question again asked for the maximum amount the individual would be willing to pay for an annual vehicle pass, but the pass would allow admission to all sites the agency manages. It was expected that the willingness-to-pay for this type of pass would be higher than the pass that allows access to only one site, since it is expected that the option to visit additional sites may have some value. With few exceptions, this seems to be true, however, future research will more rigorously test this hypothesis.

The results presented here are only preliminary since several issues in analyzing the data are as yet unresolved. The estimates in Table 14 are unweighted for mailback response bias and neither an analysis of protest bids (i.e. zero bids given because they do not like the idea of fees) nor an analysis of anchoring bias (caused by placing the referendum question before the open-ended question) have been conducted. In the latter case, the true maximum amount may not have been given because the individual may be biasing their bid toward the randomly assigned dollar amount asked in the referendum question. These issues are currently being researched.

**Referendum Questions.** Table 15 presents the percentage of yes votes for each of the ten randomly assigned, per-person per-day charges for site admission that was asked on the intercept questionnaire. As expected, the percent of yes votes generally decline at higher dollar amounts. There are several inconsistencies where higher percents of yes' occur at higher dollar amounts. When aggregated across all ten sites these inconsistencies disappear, suggesting relatively

large sample sizes may be required to achieve consistent results with this method. An overwhelming majority would be willing to pay at least one dollar per person per day at all sites except Carolina Beach State Park. Given that only 29 percent of the visitors at Carolina Beach State Park paid on-site fees (Table 13), this may reflect a protest against the charging of fees and probably does not accurately reflect the true value of the site.

Another referendum question was asked on the mail-back portion of the survey. This question was the lead-in to the maximum amount question asked for the annual vehicle pass discussed above. Again as expected, the percent of yes votes declines with increased dollar amounts with few exceptions (Table 16). As on the intercept questionnaire, when the results are aggregated across all sites, all inconsistencies disappear. The majority of those completing the mailback for all sites reported they would pay at least \$5.00 per year for such a pass, and at all but two sites the majority would pay \$10.00.

**Satisfaction Ratings.** The final section of the mail-back survey asks visitors to rate their satisfaction with the site on a scale from 1 to 10. Table 17 shows the mean values and the distribution of the ratings. The average for all sites was 8.22. The National Seashores generally had the highest ratings, with very few negatives (i.e. no rating of three or less).

### On-Going and Future Activities

**Data Collection.** In the summer of 1988, 14 additional coastal sites were surveyed; 10 in the Northeast from Maine to Virginia and four in the Northern Gulf of Mexico region from Florida to Louisiana. Six additional sites were surveyed in the Southeast and Gulf of Mexico regions of Florida and Texas during the winter and spring of 1989. During the summer of 1989, an additional 10 sites on the West Coast from California to Washington will be surveyed. At the completion of the 1989 interview season, the coastal portion of PARVS will include information on about 40 sites and contain survey data on over 12,000 visitors to coastal recreation sites across the nation.

Because the forty sites selected in the coastal PARVS sample have a mostly coastal beach focus, there may be a need to expand the sample of PARVS sites to include other types of sites such as wildlife refuges, hunting/game management areas and nature preserves. This would provide the capability to develop a more comprehensive set of activity and site specific user day values for coastal recreation.

**Estimation of User Day Values.** Researchers at SAB and North Carolina State University are currently developing travel cost demand models and contingent valuation methods using the data summarized in this report. These methods will be assessed for their ability to produce consistent and credible estimates of activity and site specific user day values.

Once accepted, these methods will be applied to the data collected at the remaining thirty sites around the Nation. The result will be a National set of user day values developed with a consistent set of data and methodologies.

**Site Valuation.** For many policy and management decisions, it is important to know the total annual value generated by a site. Here user day values must be aggregated. Estimates of total site use by activity are required. Updates of total annual site visitation are being compiled for all sites surveyed (See Appendix A for site visitation for 1984, 1982, 1977 and 1972 from NOAA Inventory of Recreation Areas and Facilities) in cooperation with the state and federal agencies managing the site.

**Changes in Site Qualities.** Total loss of a site is more rare than small, sometimes continuous changes in site qualities. Degradation of the site by water and air pollution and debris washed-up on shorelines result in losses in site value due to losses in user day values and lower visitation rates. Future research efforts will attempt to model (in a broad regional or National context) the losses in site values due to reductions in site qualities. The major focus will be on water quality.

**Total Value of Coastal Recreation.** A much more ambitious goal of the SAB program is to place a total annual value on all coastal recreation sites. To accomplish this, estimates of total coastal recreational use are required. Very little information currently exists.

To remedy this, SAB will be working with the U.S.D.A. Forest Service and the National Park Service in modifying the 1991 National Recreation Survey to obtain total use estimates for coastal recreation. Although sample sizes will be too small to provide more than broad regional estimates of use, the study combined with PARVS data and analysis will provide the capability to provide regional and National estimates of the total value of coastal recreation.

## Footnotes

1. The U.S. Forest Service has developed an analytic capability for assessing economic impacts called IMPLAN. IMPLAN provides planning analysts with the capability to construct a local and/or regional input-output model for any applicable area and to perform evaluations of potential economic effects of alternative courses of action. See Cordell et. al. (1987) for an example.

2. The overstatement of willingness-to-pay when it is perceived that the fee will not be charged but will lead to park protection or improvement, or understatement if it is perceived management is planning to impose fees but the individual is reasonably sure the park will still be protected. See Desvouges et. al. (1983) for a discussion of biases.

## References

- Bockstael, N.E., Hanemann, W.M. and Strand, I.E., 1986, "Benefit Analysis Using Indirect or Imputed Market Methods." Measuring the Benefits of Water Quality Improvements Using Recreation Demand Models, Vol. 2. Washington, D.C.: Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Policy Analysis, CR-811043-01-0, University of Maryland, 1986.
- Cordell, H. Ken, Bergstrom, John C. and Watson, Allan A., 1987, "Report on Estimates of Economic Impact of Proposed Recreational Development at Land Between the Lakes." A final report of an economic assessment study prepared for the Tennessee Valley Authority, Land Between the Lakes, Golden Pond, Kentucky 42231. Report prepared by the U.S. D.A. Forest Service, Outdoor Recreation and Wilderness Assessment Group, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Athens, Georgia.
- Desvouges, William H., Smith, V. Kerry and McGivney, Matthew P., 1983. "A Comparison of Alternative Approaches for Estimation of Recreation and Related Benefits of Water Quality Improvements". Washington, D.C.: Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Policy and Planning.
- McCurdy, Dwight R., 1970, "Recreationists Attitudes Toward User Fees: Management Implications." Journal of Forestry, 68 (8): 645-646.

McCurdy, Dwight R., 1985, Park Management. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

Schomaker, John N. and Morck, Victoria L., 1986, "Representation of Outdoor Recreation in Magazine Advertisements". In Proceedings: Southern Recreation Research Conference, February 1986. Asheville, North Carolina.

Smith, V. Kerry and Desvouges, William H., 1986, Measuring Water Quality Benefits. Kluiver-Nyhoff Publishing, Boston, Massachusetts.

Strategic Assessment Branch. The NOAA Inventory of Public Recreation Areas and Facilities in Coastal Areas. Rockville, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

## **List of Figures and Tables\***

### **Figures**

1. Recreation Sites Surveyed During the Summer 1987.
2. U.S. Bureau of the Census Regions and Divisions of the United States.
3. Comparision of Family Income Distributions for In-State and Out-of-State Visitors to Myrtle Beach State Park, South Carolina.

### **Tables**

1. Managing Agencies and Number of Completed Interviews for the 1987 PARVS Coastal Sites.
2. Distribution of Surveyed Visitors by Census Division or Country of Residence.
3. Distribution of In-State and Out-of-State Visitors, by Site.
4. Average Distance Traveled to the Ten Coastal Sites.
5. Age Distribution of All Visitors by Site, Compared to the States and the U.S.A.
6. Gender and Racial Composition of All Visitors by Site, Compared to the States and the U.S.A.
7. Distribution of All Visitors by Highest Education Level Attained, by Site.
8. Distribution of Family Income of Visitors by Site, Compared to the States and the U.S.A.
9. Distribution of Visitors by Group Size.
10. Distribution of Visitors by Group Type.
11. Average Annual Number of Days on Site and Trips to the Site, and the Average Length of Stay on Site for the Interview Trip.
12. A) Ranking of the Top Ten Main Activities of Visitors Age 16 and Older.  
B) Ranking of the Top 15 Activities of Visitors of All Ages.
13. Average Daily On-site Fees and Trip Expenditures Per Person Interviewed.
14. Maximum Willingness-to-Pay for an Annual Vehicle Pass for the Interview Site Versus Any Site the Agency Manages.
15. Willingness-to-Pay Randomly Assigned Dollar Amounts - On-site Survey.
16. Willingness-to-Pay for Vehicle Pass to Site: Randomly Assigned Dollar Amounts - Mailback Survey.
17. Satisfaction Ratings on a Scale from 1 to 10.

\*MORE DETAILED DATA IS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST.

Figure 1. Recreation Sites Surveyed During Summer 1987




Figure 2. U.S. Bureau of the Census Regions and Divisions of the United States.




Figure 3. A Comparison of Family Income Distributions for In-State and Out-of-State Visitors to Myrtle Beach State Park, South Carolina




Table 1. Managing Agencies and Number of Completed Interviews for the 1987 PARVS Coastal Sites

State/Site	Managing Agency	Number of Interviews	
		On-site	Mailback
North Carolina			
Cape Hatteras National Seashore	National Park Service	191	40
Carolina Beach State Park	NC Dept. of Natural Resources & Community Development, Division of Parks & Recreation	148	33
South Carolina			
Myrtle Beach State Park	SC Dept. of Parks, Recreation & Tourism, State Parks Division	306	74
Huntington Beach State Park	"	195	93
Edisto Beach State Park	"	330	118
Georgia			
Skidaway Island State Park	GA Dept. of Natural Resources, Division of Parks, Recreation & Historic Sites	245	71
Ft. McAllister State Historic Park	"	93	11
Jekyll Island State Park	Jekyll Island Authority	373	163
Cumberland Island National Seashore	National Park Service	299	118
Florida - Mississippi	National Park Service	261	100
Gulf Islands National Seashore			
All Ten Sites	2,441	821	

Table 2: Distribution of Surveyed Visitors by Census Division or County of Residence\*

Division/Country	Sites (Percent)**											
	All sites	10 sites	Cape Hatteras	Carolina Beach	Myrtle Beach	Huntington Beach	Edisto Beach	Skidaway Island	Fort McAllister	Cumberland Island	Jekyll Island	Gulf Islands
New England	0.7	1.1	0.0	1.0	2.6	0.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.2
Middle Atlantic	4.1	11.6	6.2	3.9	8.9	1.5	3.0	3.4	3.2	1.3	2.7	
South Atlantic	71.8	64.0	81.4	77.3	72.1	82.4	72.2	91.0	81.5	83.2	18.1	
East North Central	6.1	12.7	4.1	8.2	7.9	5.2	5.9	1.1	4.3	3.4	7.3	
East South Central	7.7	3.2	4.8	4.6	5.8	4.2	4.6	0.0	5.6	5.0	33.5	
West North Central	1.8	2.6	0.7	0.7	0.0	2.1	0.8	1.1	0.8	1.3	7.3	
West South Central	3.9	0.5	0.0	1.3	0.5	0.6	3.8	1.1	1.6	1.0	25.4	
Mountain	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.7	1.5	
Pacific	1.4	1.6	0.7	0.3	0.0	0.9	3.4	2.2	1.3	2.0	1.9	
Canada	0.9	1.1	1.4	2.6	0.5	1.5	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	
All other Foreign	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.0	0.5	0.9	4.2	0.0	0.5	1.7	1.2	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

\* U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Divisions

\*\* Toned areas show Census Division within which the site is located.

Table 3. Distribution of In-State and Out-of-State Visitors, by Site

State/Site	Visitors	
	In-State	Out-of-State
North Carolina		
Cape Hatteras National Seashore	22.5	77.5
Carolina Beach State Park	70.3	29.7
South Carolina		
Myrtle Beach State Park	52.0	48.0
Huntington Beach State Park	47.2	52.8
Edisto Beach State Park	62.8	37.2
Georgia		
Skidaway Island State Park	50.2	49.8
Ft. McAllister State Historic Park	77.4	22.6
Jekyll Island State Park	63.0	37.0
Cumberland Island National Seashore	60.9	39.1
Florida - Mississippi		
Gulf Islands National Seashore	29.5*	70.5

\*Includes Florida and Mississippi Residents

Table 4. Average Distance Traveled to the Ten Coastal Sites

State/Site	Average Miles to Site		
	From Where Started Trip <sup>1</sup>	From Site Previously Visited <sup>2</sup>	From Most Efficient Path Home <sup>3</sup>
North Carolina			
Cape Hatteras National Seashore	435	409	408
Carolina Beach State Park	257	257	257
South Carolina			
Myrtle Beach State Park	294	294	294
Huntington Beach State Park	100	78	78
Edisto Beach State Park	297	256	253
Georgia			
Skidaway Island State Park	573	206	190
Ft. McAllister State Historic Park	86	85	85
Jekyll Island State Park	321	215	205
Cumberland Island National Seashore	357	241	239
Florida-Mississippi			
Gulf Islands National Seashore	520	323	312
All Ten Sites	343	246	241

<sup>1</sup>Most people (91%) started the trip from their home, so for the majority, this represents the distance from their home to the site.

<sup>2</sup>About 32 percent of the sample were on trips where they visited multiple sites. Of these, about 50 percent (i.e., 16 percent of the entire sample) did not designate the site (where they were interviewed) as their primary destination. For those that visited other sites and the site of interview was not the primary destination, the distance from the site visited previously to the site of the interview was calculated.

<sup>3</sup>About 2 percent of the sample stopped at the site of the interview while enroute home. In these cases, the distance of the most efficient path home was calculated. For example, those who may have visited Disney World in Orlando, Florida and who live in N.Y., N.Y. would (it is assumed) be traveling on I-95 North. If they decided to stop at Skidaway Island State Park (just south of Savannah, GA), the mileage from I-95 to Skidaway Island was calculated. In most cases this had little effect on the means, however, they may play a greater role in travel cost modelling, where individual differences were sometimes great.

**Table 5. Age Distribution of All Visitors by Site, Compared to the States and the U.S.A.**

State/Site	Age Group (Percent)							
	<15	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65>
North Carolina	23	10	10	16	12	10	9	10
Cape Hatteras National Seashore	5	10	6	26	31	8	9	4
Carolina Beach State Park	14	13	11	24	20	10	5	3
South Carolina	24	10	10	17	11	10	9	9
Myrtle Beach State Park	28	11	7	18	20	8	5	3
Huntington Beach State Park	23	8	7	21	21	10	6	4
Edisto Beach State Park	28	9	8	18	18	9	6	4
Georgia	24	10	9	17	12	10	9	9
Skidaway Island State Park	5	7	9	21	22	15	13	8
Ft. McAllister State Historic Park	29	3	5	18	13	14	10	8
Jekyll Island State Park	24	11	8	21	17	9	6	4
Cumberland Island National Seashore	22	9	7	24	23	8	5	2
Florida-Mississippi								
Gulf Islands National Seashore	27	8	6	18	18	12	7	4
All 10 Sites	22	9	7	21	20	10	7	4
South Atlantic	22	9	9	16	11	10	10	12
U.S.A. Average	25	7	9	17	11	10	10	11

**Table 6.** Gender and Racial Composition of All Visitors by Site, Compared to the States and the U. S. A.

State/Site	Gender/Racial Composition (Percent)					
	Males	Native American	Asian/Pacific Island	Black	White	Other
North Carolina	48.6	1	<1	22	76	<1
Cape Hatteras National Seashore	40.1	0	<1	3	95	2
Carolina Beach State Park	44.9	0	<1	1	98	0
South Carolina	48.6	<1	<1	30	69	<1
Myrtle Beach State Park	42.9	0	<1	4	95	<1
Huntington Beach State Park	48.5	0	<1	8	91	<1
Edisto Beach State Park	47.6	2	<1	14	82	<1
Georgia	48.3	<1	<1	27	72	<1
Skidaway Island State Park	47.9	1	1	5	91	2
Ft. McAllister State Historic Park	50.7	0	<1	9	90	<1
Jekyll Island State Park	52.3	1	<1	8	90	<1
Cumberland Island National Seashore	50.0	0	<1	2	97	<1
Florida-Mississippi						
Gulf Islands National Seashore	48.2	1	2	1	95	1
All Ten Sites	47.9	<1	<1	6	92	<1
South Atlantic	48.4	<1	<1	21	78	<1
U. S. A. Average	48.6	<1	2	12	83	3

Table 7. Distribution of All Visitors by Highest Education Level Attained, by Site

State/Site	Education Levels (Percent completed)				
	8th Grade or Less	9th-11th Grade	High School Graduate	13-15 Years	College Graduate
North Carolina					
Cape Hatteras National Seashore	5.9	8.8	22.9	25.6	23.3
Carolina Beach State Park	12.7	16.8	33.3	18.6	15.5
South Carolina					
Myrtle Beach State Park	27.1	8.9	35.5	16.0	10.9
Huntington Beach State Park	21.7	10.9	19.1	23.7	15.1
Edisto Beach State Park	29.8	9.6	23.4	18.1	10.6
Georgia					
Skidaway Island State Park	6.1	11.1	29.4	26.9	10.9
Ft. McAllister State Historic Park	31.3	7.7	16.2	20.6	13.2
Jekyll Island State Park	24.4	11.2	22.2	18.0	13.5
Cumberland Island National Seashore	21.6	7.8	13.5	15.3	23.9
Florida-Mississippi					
Gulf Islands National Seashore	25.0	8.1	25.9	20.2	13.1
All Ten Sites	22.4	9.7	23.7	19.3	14.7
					7.7
					10.1

Table 8. Distribution of Family Income of Visitors by Site, Compared to the States and the U.S.A.

State/Site	Family Income Before Taxes (Percent)				
	\$10,000- \$10,000	\$10,000- \$19,999	\$20,000- \$29,999	\$30,000- \$39,999	\$40,000- \$49,999
North Carolina					
Cape Hatteras National Seashore	1.6	10.3	22.2	19.4	17.8
Carolina Beach State Park	13.6	18.5	23.5	19.7	13.6
South Carolina					
Myrtle Beach State Park	3.6	18.1	28.6	26.5	13.8
Huntington Beach State Park	5.0	10.6	18.9	28.3	15.0
Edisto Beach State Park	6.9	15.5	23.1	22.4	19.3
Georgia					
Skidaway Island State Park	6.9	16.5	18.4	18.8	21.1
Ft. McAllister State Historic Park	9.4	17.6	23.5	22.3	17.7
Jekyll Island State Park	3.6	16.1	17.0	15.5	17.6
Cumberland Island National Seashore	5.4	12.3	19.9	17.8	17.7
Florida-Mississippi					
Gulf Islands National Seashore	3.7	15.3	22.7	21.5	19.0
South Atlantic					
U. S. A. Average	29.1	29.5	21.7	10.7	4.5
All Ten Sites	4.9	14.7	21.5	21.2	17.6
					20.2
					\$50,000 and over

Table 9. Distribution of Visitors by Group Size

State/Site	Average Group Size	Group Size (Percent of total)			
		One	Two	Three-Four	Five and Up
<b>North Carolina</b>					
Cape Hatteras National Seashore	4.54	3.2	28.8	35.0	33.0
Carolina Beach State Park	3.37	17.2	30.1	31.5	21.2
<b>South Carolina</b>					
Myrtle Beach State Park	3.41	10.4	29.7	40.9	19.0
Huntington Beach State Park	3.97	7.5	40.1	34.8	17.6
Edisto Beach State Park	4.61	2.1	26.1	33.1	38.7
<b>Georgia</b>					
Skidaway Island State Park	7.44	2.1	34.4	34.8	28.7
Ft. McAllister State Historic Park	6.41	9.8	26.1	35.9	28.3
Jekyll Island State Park	5.11	2.1	31.9	29.2	36.8
Cumberland Island National Seashore	4.99	2.4	30.1	29.2	38.3
<b>Florida-Mississippi</b>					
Gulf Islands National Seashore	4.69	1.6	31.9	32.7	33.9
All Ten Sites	4.84	4.8	31.0	33.2	31.0

**Table 10. Distribution of Visitors by Group Type**

State/Site	Family	Group Type (Percent)				
		More than One Family	Friends and Family	Friends	Organized Group	One Person
<b>North Carolina</b>						
Cape Hatteras National Seashore	62.4	6.3	13.8	11.6	2.6	3.2
Carolina Beach State Park	56.3	0.0	5.8	13.6	1.0	17.2
<b>South Carolina</b>						
Myrtle Beach State Park	72.8	0.4	6.6	8.2	1.2	10.4
Huntington Beach State Park	68.1	0.5	6.9	17.0	0.0	7.5
Edisto Beach State Park	74.5	4.0	6.5	12.0	0.3	2.1
<b>Georgia</b>						
Skidaway Island State Park	74.2	2.9	6.3	9.6	4.6	2.1
Ft. McAllister State Historic Park	66.3	3.3	8.7	9.8	1.1	9.8
Jekyll Island State Park	52.5	9.9	10.2	21.5	3.5	2.1
Cumberland Island National Seashore	56.3	4.8	11.9	21.7	3.1	2.4
<b>Florida-Mississippi</b>						
Gulf Islands National Seashore	72.4	1.9	8.6	13.2	0.4	1.6
All Ten Sites	66.1	4.1	8.8	14.6	2.0	3.9
						0.5

Table 11. Average Annual Number of Days on Site and Trips to the Site, and the Average Length of Stay on Site for the Interview Trip

State/Site	Annual			Interview Trip		
	Days	Trips		Days	Trips	
		% Single Day Trips				% Single Day Trips
North Carolina						
Cape Hatteras National Seashore	7.83	2.14		6.18		13.2
Carolina Beach State Park	13.79	9.27		4.75		22.4
South Carolina						
Myrtle Beach State Park	9.48	3.61		6.31		30.7
Huntington Beach State Park	5.26	4.14		1.96		83.4
Edisto Beach State Park	7.55	3.08		5.00		26.6
Georgia						
Skidaway Island State Park	4.54	1.92		3.23		21.9
Ft. McAllister State Historic Park	8.19	7.14		2.01		51.6
Jekyll Island State Park	6.70	3.91		3.66		36.6
Cumberland Island National Seashore	3.83	1.52		3.04		41.5
Florida-Mississippi						
Gulf Islands National Seashore	7.64	3.33		4.46		26.1
All Ten Sites	7.13	3.52		4.19		34.3

Table 12a. Ranking of the Top Ten Main Activities of Visitors Age 16 and Older\*

Activities	Sites (Rank and Percent)																					
	All	Ten	Cape	Carolina	Myrtle	Huntington	Edisto	Skidaway	Fort	Jekyll	Cumberland	Gulf										
	Sites	Sites	Sites	Beach	Beach	Beach	Beach	Island	McAllister	Island	Island	Island										
No Main Activity	1	30.0	2	22.5	1	82.4	4	8.2	3	13.3	1	44.1	2	21.2	5	3.3	1	37.2	1	20.7	1	58.2
Developed Camping	2	14.8	5	5.2	3	2.7	1	42.2	4	12.3	3	10.6	1	26.9	3	21.5	6	4.6	2	13.4	3	6.5
Other Outdoor Swimming	3	13.8	1	36.6	2	7.4	5	4.6	1	25.6	2	17.8	9	2.0	-	0.0	2	16.4	5	9.7	2	14.9
Sightseeing	4	5.7	3	15.2	6	1.4	8	0.3	2	14.4	7	3.0	5	7.3	-	0.0	11	1.6	4	12.4	5	3.4
Picnicking	5	5.0	-	0.0	7	0.7	3	16.7	5	6.2	8	2.4	4	7.3	1	24.7	10	2.7	14	0.3	-	0.0
Pool Swimming	6	4.4	-	0.0	-	0.0	2	21.9	-	0.0	-	0.0	3	9.8	-	0.0	7	4.3	-	0.0	-	0.0
Saltwater Fishing	7	4.2	6	2.6	4	2.0	6	3.9	9	3.1	4	4.2	8	2.4	4	18.3	4	7.2	15	0.3	4	4.2
Visiting Historical Sites	8	3.3	4	6.8	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	6	6.5	2	23.7	9	2.9	8	3.7	7	1.9
Wildlife Observation	9	2.2	8	1.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	8	3.6	-	0.0	10	1.6	-	0.0	-	0.0	3	13.0	12	0.4
Sunbathing	10	2.1	7	1.0	-	0.0	7	0.3	7	4.1	6	3.6	-	0.0	-	0.0	5	4.8	13	1.7	6	1.9

\*After the person interviewed indicated all the activities for which they participated, they were asked which, if any, activity was their main activity.

Table 12b. Ranking of the Top 15 Activities of Visitors of All Ages\*

Activities	Sites (Rank and Percent)											
	All Ten Sites	Cape Hatteras	Carolina Beach Rank %	Myrtle Beach Rank %	Huntington Beach Rank %	Edisto Beach Rank %	Skidaway Island Rank %	McAllister Island Rank %	Fort Jekyll Island Rank %	Cumberland Island Rank %	Gulf Island Rank %	
	Rank %											
Other Outdoor Swimming	1	56.9	2	88.1	1	75.6	5	56.7	3	69.0	15	6.1
Walking For Pleasure	2	53.2	5	61.6	2	56.4	3	64.8	2	64.9	2	57.4
Picnicking	3	49.8	6	39.9	9	14.8	2	73.2	6	28.8	4	39.4
Sightseeing	4	48.2	1	89.0	3	38.2	6	45.5	1	74.6	5	35.4
Developed Camping	5	38.0	10	27.3	10	13.8	4	63.7	11	15.5	6	34.9
Visiting Historical Sites	6	28.4	4	66.7	12	9.4	18	2.2	7	22.0	12	8.3
Visiting Museums	7	26.1	3	67.3	6	17.5	12	9.1	12	11.5	16	3.7
Pool Swimming	8	25.4	15	14.1	4	29.3	1	77.8	20	2.4	17	1.5
Collecting Seashells	9	25.3	7	38.7	6	17.5	10	21.8	4	36.1	3	40.3
Wildlife Observation	10	23.5	8	33.9	11	10.1	11	12.8	5	32.5	8	14.2
Saltwater Fishing	11	19.3	11	24.1	5	20.2	9	22.7	9	16.3	7	21.4
Family Gathering	12	16.2	9	28.3	7	16.5	8	25.5	16	6.8	10	12.9
Photography	13	15.2	12	23.2	8	15.3	7	27.2	8	18.3	12	9.2
Hiking	14	13.4	20	11.8	14	3.7	13	7.3	17	5.6	14	7.5
Sunbathing	15	12.4	16	13.3	16	1.7	17	2.4	13	9.5	9	13.1

\*Percent of all those in vehicles sampled that participated in activities.

**Table 13. Average Daily On-site Fees and Trip Expenditures Per Person Interviewed**

State/Site	Onsite Fees (\$)	% Interviewed that paid fees	Average Expenditures Per Person* On Trip When Interviewed		
			While preparing for trip	While traveling to and from the site	While visiting site or immediate area
North Carolina					Total
Cape Hatteras National Seashore	2.96	31.4	52	69	149
Carolina Beach State Park	.99	29.1	41	25	91
South Carolina					
Myrtle Beach State Park	10.40	59.8	46	28	99
Huntington Beach State Park	3.08	88.7	59	58	155
Edisto Beach State Park	6.84	75.2	71	57	82
Georgia					
Skidaway Island State Park	7.24	63.7	173	130	57
Ft. McAllister State Historic Park	8.20	68.8	46	42	14
Jekyll Island State Park	4.04	63.8	46	62	89
Cumberland Island National Seashore	17.44	77.3	88	102	38
Florida - Mississippi					
Gulf Islands National Seashore	5.28	33.0	68	103	103
All Ten Sites	7.30	66.7	71	73	90
					274
					234

<sup>1</sup> These expenditures are reported in the mailback portion of the survey. They are unweighted for sample response bias and for three sites the sample sizes are too small for statistical reliability; Cape Hatteras National Seashore (20%), Carolina Beach State Park (23%), and Ft. McAllister State Historic Park (12%).

**Table 14. Maximum Willingness-to-Pay for an Annual Vehicle Pass for the Interview Site Versus Any Site the Agency Manages**

State/Site	Interview Site*(\$)			Any Site Agency Manages(\$)**		
	Mean	Std Error	N	Mean	Std Error	N
North Carolina						
Cape Hatteras	7.37	1.65	40	16.62	3.16	40
Carolina Beach State Park	8.87	3.52	30	6.03	1.57	30
South Carolina						
Myrtle Beach State Park	9.66	1.80	71	9.46	1.35	71
Huntington Beach State Park	7.82	1.31	90	13.09	1.71	90
Edisto Beach State Park	7.48	1.17	117	11.89	1.59	117
Georgia						
Skidaway Island State Park	2.94	0.89	68	7.99	1.48	68
Ft. McAllister State Historic Site	4.09	2.41	11	5.73	2.61	11
Jekyll Island State Park	5.45	0.83	159	11.75	1.73	159
Cumberland Is. Nat. Seashore	17.52	8.49	118	25.83	8.55	118
Florida - Mississippi						
Gulf Islands National Seashore	6.38	1.29	97	13.90	2.87	96
All Ten Sites	8.30	1.37	770	13.52	1.46	769

\*Pass would admit all persons in the vehicle at the interview site only and is good for one year.

\*\*Pass would admit all persons in the vehicle to any site the agency manages and is good for one year.

**Table 15. Willingness-to-Pay Randomly Assigned Dollar Amounts - On-site Survey**

State/Site	Dollars Per Person Per Day (Percent Yes)*						
	1.00	2.00	5.00	7.50	10.00	12.50	15.00
North Carolina							
Cape Hatteras National Seashore	85.19	79.17	45.83	21.74	47.83	12.50	14.29
Carolina Beach State Park	42.86	43.75	42.86	20.00	13.33	6.67	20.00
South Carolina							
Myrtle Beach State Park	82.35	82.14	79.41	82.76	50.00	28.57	28.00
Huntington Beach State Park	90.00	55.17	40.74	16.67	0.00	0.00	11.76
Edisto Beach State Park	67.57	44.44	31.58	30.56	8.33	12.50	16.13
Georgia							
Skidaway Island State Park	88.46	90.00	39.13	30.00	16.67	0.00	7.41
Fort McAllister State Historic Park	90.00	75.00	18.18	12.50	30.00	0.00	0.00
Jekyll Island State Park	69.23	52.63	28.21	10.81	27.03	10.81	8.11
Cumberland Island National Seashore	98.68	94.12	89.80	85.71	61.54	42.86	62.50
Florida-Mississippi							
Gulf Islands National Seashore	78.57	57.69	25.00	23.08	28.57	16.00	30.77
All Ten Sites	82.55	70.39	48.78	37.15	28.85	13.97	17.70

\* Toned areas show dollar amounts for which a majority (i.e. 50% or more) of those interviewed responded that they would pay the fee.

Table 16. Willingness-to-Pay for Vehicle Pass to Site: Randomly Assigned Dollar Amounts - Mailback Survey

State/Site	Dollars Per Year for Vehicle Pass (%Yes)								Number of Responses
	1.00	5.00	10.00	15.00	25.00	50.00	100.00		
<b>North Carolina</b>									
Cape Hatteras National Seashore	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	22
Carolina Beach State Park	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	26
<b>South Carolina</b>									
Myrtle Beach State Park	**85.71	87.50	100.0	55.56	62.50	25.00	0.00	46	
Huntington Beach State Park	100.0	61.11	55.56	18.18	23.08	0.00	14.29	80	
Edisto Beach State Park	68.42	76.47	40.00	66.67	42.86	20.00	7.14	109	
<b>Georgia</b>									
Skidaway Island State Park	81.82	50.00	40.00	25.00	6.25	0.00	10.00	61	
Ft. McAllister State Historic Park	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	8
Jekyll Island State Park	81.25	70.59	61.11	29.17	27.27	0.00	4.76	137	
Cumberland Island National Seashore	85.71	89.29	83.33	77.78	77.78	12.50	0.00	105	
<b>Florida-Mississippi</b>									
Gulf Islands National Seashore	60.00	83.33	54.55	44.44	30.77	7.69	6.25	89	
All Ten Sites	79.34	75.00	62.79	42.70	32.04	7.69	7.79	666	

\* Insufficient number of mailback responses

\*\* Toned areas show dollar amount for which a majority (i.e. 50% or more) of those interviewed responded that they would buy the pass.

Table 17. Satisfaction Ratings on a Scale from 1 to 10

## **APPENDIX**

A. Site Profiles - NOAA Inventory of Public Recreation Areas and Facilities in Coastal Areas.

NOAA INVENTORY OF PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS AND FACILITIES IN COASTAL AREAS, FY 1984

SITE NAME: CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE

MANAGING AGENCY: NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

LATITUDE - LONGITUDE: 3518N07534W

1984 ACREAGE BY COASTAL COUNTY \*

COUNTY	ACRES
DARE , NC	24704
HYDE , NC	5615
;	;
;	;
;	;

\*\*\*\*\*  
TYPE OF AREA  
\*\*\*\*\*

ADJACENT TO OR INCLUDING A BODY OF WATER	YES	1984	LAND	WATER	TOTAL
ADJACENT TO BODIES OF WATER UNDER TIDAL INFLUENCES	YES	1984	25319	5000	30319
ADJACENT TO OPEN OCEAN WATERS	YES	1982	25319	5000	30319
OFFSHORE	YES	1977	25319	5000	30319
ON BARRIER ISLAND	YES	1972	25319	5000	30319
OPEN OCEAN ISLAND	NO	;	;	;	;
ON ESTUARY/EMBAYMENT ISLAND	NO	;	;	;	;
ON UNCLASSIFIED ISLAND	NO	;	;	;	;

\* 0 PERCENT OF THE 1984 ACREAGE IS IN  
NONCOASTAL COUNTIES.

INVENTORY OF FACILITIES

	ACREAGE	BUDGET & PERSONNEL
ARTIFICIAL REEFS	0 #	1984 EXPENDITURES \$ 3237800
FISHING PIERS	3 #	CAPITAL (\$) 3430000
BOAT RAMPS	1 #	OPERATING (\$) 5883227
BOAT SLIPS	50 #	1982 0
BOAT DOCKS (WITHOUT SLIPS)	50 #	1977 8000
CAMPSPACES (RV AND TENT)	600 #	1972 2546000
RECREATIONAL SHELLFISH BEDS	0 ACRES	2693600
HUNTING/GAME MANAGEMENT AREA	3000 ACRES	436207
CONSERVATION/SCENIC AREA	27319 LINEAR FT	2400000
BEACH	422400 MILES	574551
TRAILS	95 MILES	2000000
OUTDOOR SWIMMING POOLS	0 #	B
PICNIC TABLES	630 #	140.0
GOLF COURSES	0 #	
DRIVING RANGES	0 #	
OUTDOOR COURTS	0 #	
FIELD SPORT AREAS	0 #	
PARKING SPACES AT HISTORICAL/CULTURAL SITES	300 #	
PARKING SPACES AT ALL OTHER SITES	600 #	
		USER DAYS - ATTENDANCE
		1984 1396100
		1982 1698500
		1977 1786500
		1972 1565054

MISSING INFORMATION CODES

A = SITE DID NOT EXIST  
 B = RECORDS NOT KEPT ON THIS DATA ELEMENT  
 C = RECORDS TOO COSTLY TO RETRIEVE  
 D = AGENCY DID NOT RESPOND TO SURVEY  
 E = AGENCY LOST RECORDS  
 F = SATELITE PARK - DATA IN OTHER PARK  
 G = LATITUDE - LONGITUDE NOT FOUND

\*\*\*\*\*  
STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT BRANCH  
 OCEAN ASSESSMENTS DIVISION  
 OFFICE OF OCEANOGRAPHY AND MARINE ASSESSMENTS  
 NATIONAL OCEANIC SERVICE  
 NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION  
 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 PHONE (301) 443-8843/8921

\*\*\*\*\*

NOAA INVENTORY OF PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS AND FACILITIES IN COASTAL AREAS, FY 1984

SITE NAME: CAROLINA BEACH STATE PARK  
 MANAGING AGENCY: NC PARKS & RECREATION

LATITUDE - LONGITUDE: 3402N07753W

1984 ACREAGE BY COASTAL COUNTY \*

COUNTY	NEW HANOVER
ACRES	1773

TYPE OF AREA		ACREAGE	
ADJACENT TO OR INCLUDING A BODY OF WATER	YES	1984	LAND 1743
ADJACENT TO BODIES OF WATER UNDER TIDAL INFLUENCES	YES	1982	WATER 30
ADJACENT TO OPEN OCEAN WATERS	NO	1977	1743
OFFSHORE	YES	1972	30
ON BARRIER ISLAND	NO	443	30
ON OPEN OCEAN ISLAND	NO		
ON ESTUARY/EMBAYMENT ISLAND	NO		
ON UNCLASSIFIED ISLAND	YES		
	NO		

\* 0 PERCENT OF THE 1984 ACREAGE IS IN NONCOASTAL COUNTIES.

INVENTORY OF FACILITIES

		EXPENDITURES	REVENUE	PERSONNEL
ARTIFICIAL REEFS	0 #	1984 CAPITAL (\$)	\$ 165540	(FTE) 6.0
FISHING PIERS	0 #	1982 15000	148986	5.0
BOAT RAMPS	2 #	1977 0	115878	4.0
BOAT SLIPS	14 #	1972 0	99324	3.0
BOAT DOCKS (WITHOUT SLIPS)	0 #			
CAMPSITES (RV AND TENT)	83 #			
RECREATIONAL SHELLFISH BEDS	0 #			
HUNTING/GAME MANAGEMENT AREA	0 #			
CONSERVATION/SCENIC AREA	0 #			
BEACH TRAILS	1600 ACRES			
OUTDOOR SWIMMING POOLS	300 LINEAR FT			
PICNIC TABLES	5 MILES			
GOLF COURSES	0 #			
DRIVING RANGES	0 #			
OUTDOOR COURTS	0 #			
FIELD SPORT AREAS	0 #			
PARKING SPACES AT HISTORICAL/CULTURAL SITES	0 #			
PARKING SPACES AT ALL OTHER SITES	162 #			

MISSING INFORMATION CODES

- A = SITE DID NOT EXIST
- B = RECORDS NOT KEPT ON THIS DATA ELEMENT
- C = RECORDS TOO COSTLY TO RETRIEVE
- D = AGENCY DID NOT RESPOND TO SURVEY
- E = AGENCY LOST RECORDS
- F = SATELLITE PARK - DATA IN OTHER PARK
- G = LATITUDE - LONGITUDE NOT FOUND

STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT BRANCH  
 OCEAN ASSESSMENTS DIVISION  
 OFFICE OF OCEANOGRAPHY AND MARINE ASSESSMENTS  
 NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION  
 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 PHONE (301) 443-8843/8921

## NOAA INVENTORY OF PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS AND FACILITIES IN COASTAL AREAS, FY 1984

SITE NAME: MYRTLE BEACH STATE PARK

MANAGING AGENCY: SC PARKS, RECREATION &amp; TOURISM

LATITUDE - LONGITUDE: 3339N07855W

1984 ACREAGE BY COASTAL COUNTY \*

COUNTY	ACRES
HORRY	312
:	:

*****		*****	
TYPE OF AREA	ACREAGE	LAND	WATER
ADJACENT TO OR INCLUDING A BODY OF WATER	YES	1984	TOTAL
ADJACENT TO BODIES OF WATER UNDER TIDAL INFLUENCES	YES	312	312
ADJACENT TO OPEN OCEAN WATERS	YES	312	312
OFFSHORE	NO	312	312
ON BARRIER ISLAND	NO	312	312
ON OPEN OCEAN ISLAND	NO	0	0
ON ESTUARY/EMBAYMENT ISLAND	NO	0	0
ON UNCLASSIFIED ISLAND	NO	0	0
* 0 PERCENT OF THE 1984 ACREAGE IS IN NONCOASTAL COUNTIES.			

## INVENTORY OF FACILITIES

*****		*****	
		BUDGET & PERSONNEL	
		EXPENDITURES	REVENUE
ARTIFICIAL REEFS	0	CAPITAL (\$)	\$
FISHING PIERS	0	OPERATING (\$)	
BOAT RAMPS	0	618117	954135
BOAT SLIPS	0	24431	503526
BOAT DOCKS (WITHOUT SLIPS)	0	1982	789659
CAMPSITES (RV AND TENT)	0	1977	555808
RECREATIONAL SHELLFISH BEDS	325	B	B
HUNTING/GAME MANAGEMENT AREA	0	1972	309474
CONSERVATION/SCENIC AREA	0		
BEACH	0		
TRAILS	0		
OUTDOOR SWIMMING POOLS	50		
PICNIC TABLES	5280	LINEAR FT	
GOLF COURSES	1	MILES	
DRIVING RANGES	300	#	
OUTDOOR COURTS	0	#	
FIELD SPORT AREAS	0	#	
PARKING SPACES AT HISTORICAL/CULTURAL SITES	0	#	
PARKING SPACES AT ALL OTHER SITES	350	#	
USER DAYS - ATTENDANCE			

## MISSING INFORMATION CODES

- A = SITE DID NOT EXIST
- B = RECORDS NOT KEPT ON THIS DATA ELEMENT
- C = RECORDS TOO COSTLY TO RETRIEVE
- D = AGENCY DID NOT RESPOND TO SURVEY
- E = AGENCY LOST RECORDS
- F = SATELLITE PARK - DATA IN OTHER PARK
- G = LATITUDE - LONGITUDE NOT FOUND

STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT BRANCH  
 OCEAN ASSESSMENTS DIVISION  
 OFFICE OF OCEANOGRAPHY AND MARINE ASSESSMENTS  
 NATIONAL OCEANIC SERVICE  
 NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION  
 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 PHONE (301) 443-8843/8921

NOAA INVENTORY OF PUBLIC RECREATION AREAS AND FACILITIES IN COASTAL AREAS, FY 1984

SITE NAME: HUNTINGTON BEACH STATE PARK  
MANAGING AGENCY: SC PARKS, RECREATION & TOURISM  
LATITUDE = LONGITUDE: 3331N07905W

1984 ACREAGE BY COASTAL COUNTY \*

COUNTY	GEORGETOWN	ACRES 2500
--------	------------	---------------

TYPE OF AREA

YES YES YES YES YES YES  
 YES YES YES YES YES YES YES  
 YES YES YES YES YES YES YES  
 NO NO NO NO NO NO NO  
 NO NO NO NO NO NO NO  
 NO NO NO NO NO NO NO

## INVENTORY OF FACILITIES

- ARTIFICIAL REEFS . . . . .
- FISHING PIERS . . . . .
- BOAT RAMPS . . . . .
- BOAT DOCKS (WITHOUT SLIPS)
- CAMPSPACES (RV AND TENT)
- RECREATIONAL SHELLFISH BEDS
- HUNTING/GAME MANAGEMENT AREA
- CONSERVATION/SCENIC AREA
- BEACH . . . . .
- TRAILS . . . . .
- OUTDOOR SWIMMING POOLS . . . . .
- PICNIC TABLES . . . . .
- GOLF COURSES . . . . .
- DRIVING RANGES . . . . .
- OUTDOOR COURTS . . . . .
- FIELD SPORT AREAS . . . . .
- PARKING SPACES AT HISTORICAL/CULTURAL SITES . . . . .
- PARKING SPACES AT ALL OTHER SITES . . . . .

## BUDGET & PERSONNEL

\* 0 PERCENT OF THE 1984 ACREAGE IS IN  
NONCOASTAL COUNTIES.

MISSING INFORMATION CODES

A = SITE DID NOT EXIST  
 B = RECORDS TOO COSTLY TO RETRIEVE  
 C = AGENCY DID NOT RESPOND TO SURVEY  
 D = AGENCY LOST RECORDS  
 E = SATELLITE PARK - DATA IN OTHER PARK  
 F = LATITUDE - LONGITUDE NOT FOUND

STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT BRANCH  
OCEAN ASSESSMENTS DIVISION  
OFFICE OF OCEANOGRAPHY AND MARINE ASSESSMENTS  
NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE  
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
PHONE (301) 443-8843/8921

NOAA INVENTORY OF PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS AND FACILITIES IN COASTAL AREAS, FY 1984

SITE NAME: EDISTO BEACH STATE PARK

MANAGING SCENARIOS

PRIMING AGENTS: SU FAKS, KLUKETIUM & LUCKISH

HATITUDE = LONGITUDE: 3302 NO 80269 M

1984 ACREAGE BY COASTAL COUNTY \*

COASTAL COUNTY	ACRES
COLLETON	1255

卷之三

TYPE OF AREA	ACREAGE			TOTAL
	LAND	WATER		
ADJACENT TO OR INCLUDING A BODY OF WATER	1984	1255	0	1255
ADJACENT TO BODIES OF WATER UNDER TIDAL INFLUENCES	YES	1255	0	1255
ADJACENT TO OPEN OCEAN WATERS.	YES	1255	0	1255
OFFSHORE	NO	1255	0	1255
ON BARRIER ISLAND	NO	1255	0	1255
ON OPEN OCEAN ISLAND	NO	1255	0	1255
ON ESTUARY/EMBAYMENT ISLAND	NO	1255	0	1255
ON UNCLASSIFIED ISLAND	NO	1255	0	1255

\* 0 PERCENT OF THE 1984 ACREAGE IS IN NONCOASTAL COUNTIES.

## INVENTORY OF FACILITIES

	CAPITAL (\$)	OPERATING (\$)	\$	(FTE)
ARTIFICIAL REEFS	0	0	\$ 12.5	
FISHING PIERS	0	0	141021	
BOAT RAMPS	1984	207680	145571	
BOAT SLIPS	1982	176624	0	12.5
BOAT DOCKS (WITHOUT SLIPS)	1977	197426	B	10.5
CAMPSITES (RV AND TENT)	1972	138776	B	10.5
RECREATIONAL SHELLFISH BEDS			B	8.0
HUNTING/GAME MANAGEMENT AREA				
CONSERVATION/SCENIC AREA				
TRAILS				
OUTDOOR SWIMMING POOLS				
PICNIC TABLES				
GOLF COURSES				
DRIVING RANGES				
OUTDOOR COURTS				
FIELD SPORT AREAS				
PARKING SPACES AT HISTORICAL/CULTURAL SITES				
PARKING SPACES AT ALL OTHER SITES				
				USER DAYS - ATTENDANCE
				1984 223986
				1982 282779
				1977 506688
				1972 173418

MISSING INFORMATION CODES

A = SITE DID NOT EXIST  
B = RECORDS NOT KEPT ON THIS DATA ELEMENT  
C = RECORDS TOO COSTLY TO RETRIEVE  
D = AGENCY DID NOT RESPOND TO SURVEY  
E = AGENCY LOST RECORDS  
F = SATELLITE PARK - DATA IN OTHER PARK  
G = LATITUDE - LONGITUDE NOT FOUND

STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT BRANCH  
OCEAN ASSESSMENTS DIVISION AND  
OFFICE OF OCEANOGRAPHY AND  
NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE  
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
PHONE (301) 443-8834-8921

## NOAA INVENTORY OF PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS AND FACILITIES IN COASTAL AREAS, FY 1984

SITE NAME: SKIDAWAY ISLAND STATE PARK

MANAGING AGENCY: GA PARKS, REC. &amp; HIST. SITES

LATITUDE - LONGITUDE: 3156N08101W

1984 ACREAGE BY COASTAL COUNTY \*

COUNTY	ACRES
CHATHAM	490

## \*\*\*\*\* TYPE OF AREA \*\*\*\*\*

ADJACENT TO OR INCLUDING A BODY OF WATER	YES	1984	LAND	WATER	TOTAL
ADJACENT TO BODIES OF WATER UNDER TIDAL INFLUENCES	YES	490	490	0	490
ADJACENT TO OPEN OCEAN WATERS	NO	1982	490	0	490
OFFSHORE	NO	1977	490	0	490
ON BARRIER ISLAND	YES	1972	490	0	490
ON OPEN OCEAN ISLAND	NO				
ON ESTUARY/EMBAYMENT ISLAND	NO				
ON UNCLASSIFIED ISLAND	NO				

\* 0 PERCENT OF THE 1984 ACREAGE IS IN  
NONCOASTAL COUNTIES.

## INVENTORY OF FACILITIES

ARTIFICIAL REEFS	0	#	1984	CAPITAL (\$)	OPERATING (\$)	\$	3.0
FISHING PIERS	0	#	1982	0	71854	72303	3.0
BOAT RAMPS	0	#	1977	0	61175	50666	B
BOAT SLIPS (WITHOUT SLIPS)	0	#	1972	B	B	31470	B
BOAT DOCKS (RV AND TENT)	0	#					
CAMPSPACES (RV AND TENT)	100	#					
RECREATIONAL SHELLFISH BEDS	0	#					
HUNTING/GAME MANAGEMENT AREA	0	#					
CONSERVATION/SCENIC AREA	490	ACRES					
BEACH TRAILS	0	ACRES					
OUTDOOR SWIMMING POOLS	1	MILES					
PICNIC TABLES	1	#					
GOLF COURSES	100	#					
DRIVING RANGES	0	#					
OUTDOOR COURTS	0	#					
FIELD SPORT AREAS	0	#					
PARKING SPACES AT HISTORICAL/CULTURAL SITES	0	#					
PARKING SPACES AT ALL OTHER SITES	0	#					

## MISSING INFORMATION CODES

- A = SITE DID NOT EXIST
- B = RECORDS NOT KEPT ON THIS DATA ELEMENT
- C = RECORDS TOO COSTLY TO RETRIEVE
- D = AGENCY DID NOT RESPOND TO SURVEY
- E = AGENCY LOST RECORDS
- F = SATELLITE PARK - DATA IN OTHER PARK
- G = LATITUDE - LONGITUDE NOT FOUND

STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT BRANCH  
OCEAN ASSESSMENTS DIVISION  
OFFICE OF OCEANOGRAPHY AND MARINE ASSESSMENTS  
NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE  
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
PHONE (301) 443-8843/8921

## NOAA INVENTORY OF PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS AND FACILITIES IN COASTAL AREAS, FY 1984

SITE NAME: FORT MCALLISTER STATE HISTORIC PARK

MANAGING AGENCY: GA PARKS, REC. &amp; HIST. SITES

LATITUDE - LONGITUDE: 3153N0811W

1984 ACREAGE BY COASTAL COUNTY \*

COUNTY	ACRES
BRYAN	1693

TYPE OF AREA		ACREAGE	
ADJACENT TO OR INCLUDING A BODY OF WATER	YES	1984	LAND
ADJACENT TO BODIES OF WATER UNDER TIDAL INFLUENCES	YES	1693	WATER
ADJACENT TO OPEN OCEAN WATERS.	NO	1693	0
OFFSHORE	NO	1693	0
ON BARRIER ISLAND	NO	1693	0
ON OPEN OCEAN ISLAND	NO	1693	0
ON ESTUARY/EMBAYMENT ISLAND	NO	1693	0
ON UNCLASSIFIED ISLAND	NO	1693	0

\* 0 PERCENT OF THE 1984 ACREAGE IS IN  
NONCOASTAL COUNTIES.

## INVENTORY OF FACILITIES

		EXPENDITURES	REVENUE	PERSONNEL
ARTIFICIAL REEFS	0	#	1984 CAPITAL (\$)	(\$ FTE)
FISHING PIERS	1	#	1982 OPERATING (\$)	\$ 5.0
BOAT RAMPS	2	#	1977 0	5.0
BOAT SLIPS	0	#	1977 B	B
BOAT DOCKS (WITHOUT SLIPS)	0	#	1972 B	399 B
CAMP/SITES (RV AND TENT)	1	#		
RECREATIONAL SHELLFISH BEDS	75	ACRES		
HUNTING/GAME MANAGEMENT AREA	0	ACRES		
CONSERVATION/SCENIC AREA	1693	ACRES		
BEACH	0	LINEAR FT		
TRAILS	0	MILES		
OUTDOOR SWIMMING POOLS	2	MILES		
PICNIC TABLES	0	#		
GOLF COURSES	50	#		
DRIVING RANGES	0	#		
OUTDOOR COURTS	0	#		
FIELD SPORT AREAS	0	#		
PARKING SPACES AT HISTORICAL/CULTURAL SITES	0	#		
PARKING SPACES AT ALL OTHER SITES	0	#		

## MISSING INFORMATION CODES

- A = SITE DID NOT EXIST
- B = RECORDS NOT KEPT ON THIS DATA ELEMENT
- C = RECORDS TOO COSTLY TO RETRIEVE
- D = AGENCY DID NOT RESPOND TO SURVEY
- E = AGENCY LOST RECORDS
- F = SATELLITE PARK - DATA IN OTHER PARK
- G = LATITUDE - LONGITUDE NOT FOUND

STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT BRANCH  
OCEAN ASSESSMENTS DIVISION  
OFFICE OF OCEANOGRAPHY AND MARINE ASSESSMENTS  
NATIONAL OCEANIC SERVICE  
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
PHONE (301) 443-8843/8321

## NOAA INVENTORY OF PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS AND FACILITIES IN COASTAL AREAS, FY 1984

SITE NAME: Jekyll Island State Park

MANAGING AGENCY: GA - Jekyll Island Authority

LATITUDE - LONGITUDE: 3104N 08127W

1984 ACREAGE BY COASTAL COUNTY \*

COUNTY	ACRES
GLYNN	5800

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

## TYPE OF AREA

ADJACENT TO OR INCLUDING A BODY OF WATER	YES	1984	LAND	WATER	TOTAL
ADJACENT TO BODIES OF WATER UNDER TIDAL INFLUENCES	YES	1982	5600	200	5800
ADJACENT TO OPEN OCEAN WATERS.	YES	1977	5600	200	5800
OFFSHORE	NO	1972	5600	200	5800
ON BARRIER ISLAND	NO				
ON OPEN OCEAN ISLAND	NO				
ON ESTUARY/INBAYMENT ISLAND	NO				
ON UNCLASSIFIED ISLAND	NO				

\* 0 PERCENT OF THE 1984 ACREAGE IS IN  
NONCOASTAL COUNTIES.

## INVENTORY OF FACILITIES

			EXPENDITURES	REVENUE	PERSONNEL
ARTIFICIAL REEFS	0	#	CAPITAL (\$)	OPERATING (\$)	(FTE)
FISHING PIERS	1	#	1984 165000	2637000	\$ 2295500
BOAT RAMPS	2	#	1982 34800	1970000	1736000
BOAT SLIPS (WITHOUT SLIPS)	0	#	1977 B	1230000	9272000
BOAT DOCKS (RV AND TENT)	1	#	1972 B	8500000	627000
CAMPSPACES (RV AND TENT)	225	#			
RECREATIONAL SHELLFISH BEDS	0	ACRES			
HUNTING/GAME MANAGEMENT AREA	0	ACRES			
CONSERVATION/SCENIC AREA	5600	ACRES			
BEACH	58080	LINEAR FT			
TRAILS	20	MILES			
OUTDOOR SWIMMING POOLS	2	#			
PICNIC TABLES	500	#			
GOLF COURSES	3	#			
DRIVING RANGES	3	#			
OUTDOOR COURTS	10	#			
FIELD SPORT AREAS	2	#			
PARKING SPACES AT HISTORICAL/CULTURAL SITES	1500	#			
PARKING SPACES AT ALL OTHER SITES	30000	#			
			USER DAYS - ATTENDANCE		
				1984 1750000	
				1982 1487500	
				1977 B	
				1972 B	

## MISSING INFORMATION CODES

- A = SITE DID NOT EXIST
- B = RECORDS NOT KEPT ON THIS DATA ELEMENT
- C = RECORDS TOO COSTLY TO RETRIEVE
- D = AGENCY DID NOT RESPOND TO SURVEY
- E = AGENCY LOST RECORDS
- F = SATELLITE PARK - DATA IN OTHER PARK
- G = LATITUDE - LONGITUDE NOT FOUND

STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT BRANCH  
OCEAN ASSESSMENTS DIVISION  
OFFICE OF OCEANOGRAPHY AND MARINE ASSESSMENTS  
NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE  
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
PHONE (301) 443-8843/8921

NOAA INVENTORY OF PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS AND FACILITIES IN COASTAL AREAS, FY 1984

SITE NAME: CUMBERLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE

MANAGING INNOVATION: NATIONAL PARK STRATEGIES

MANAGING AGENCY: NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

LATITUDE - LONGITUDE: 3051N08126W

TYPE OF AREA

YES YES YES YES YES YES NO NO NO

ADJACENT TO OR INCLUDING A BODY OF WATER  
ADJACENT TO BODIES OF WATER UNDER TIDAL INFLUENCES  
ADJACENT TO OPEN OCEAN WATERS.

OFFSHORE . . . . .

ON BARRIER ISLAND . . . . .

ON OPEN OCEAN ISLAND . . . . .

ON ESTUARY/EMBAYMENT ISLAND . . . . .

ON UNCLASSIFIED ISLAND . . . . .

## INVENTORY OF FACILITIES

## BUDGET & PERSONNEL

RES		RES		NEAR FT		LLES		USER DAYS - ATTENDANCE	
EXPENDITURES	CAPITAL (\$)	OPERATING (\$)	(\$)	REVENUE	(\$)	(FTE)	PERSONNEL		
1984	0	856500	\$	0		28.0			
1982	0	831400		0		28.0			
1977	142000	B		0		B			
1972	A	A		A		A			

## ACREAGE

	LAND	WATER	TOTAL	
984	17678	1000	18678	
982	17678	1000	18678	B
977	B	B		A
972	A	A		

O PERCENT OF THE 1984 ACREAGE IS IN  
NONCOASTAL COUNTIES.

\* 0 PERCENT OF THE 1984 ACREAGE IS IN  
NONCOASTAL COUNTIES.

\*\*\*\*\*

MISSING INFORMATION CODES

A = SITE DID NOT EXIST  
 B = RECORDS NOT KEPT ON THIS DATA ELEMENT  
 C = RECORDS TOO COSTLY TO RETRIEVE  
 D = AGENCY DID NOT RESPOND TO SURVEY  
 E = AGENCY LOST RECORDS  
 F = SATELLITE PARK - DATA IN OTHER PARK  
 G = LATITUDE - LONGITUDE NOT FOUND

STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT BRANCH  
OCEAN ASSESSMENTS DIVISION  
OFFICE OF OCEANOGRAPHY AND  
NATIONAL OCEANIC SERVICE  
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC  
ADMINISTRATION OF COMMERCE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
PHONE (301) 667-8844/88921

## NOAA INVENTORY OF PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS AND FACILITIES IN COASTAL AREAS, FY 1984

SITE NAME: GULF ISLANDS NATIONAL SEASHORE

MANAGING AGENCY: NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

LATITUDE - LONGITUDE: 3014N 0834W

## 1984 ACREAGE BY COASTAL COUNTY \*

COUNTY	ACRES
ESCAMBIA , FL	22861
OKALOOSA , FL	3485
SANTA ROSA , FL	2700
HARRISON , MS	19997
JACKSON , MS	49870

\*\*\*\*\*  
TYPE OF AREA  
\*\*\*\*\*

ADJACENT TO OR INCLUDING A BODY OF WATER	YES	1984	LAND	WATER	TOTAL
ADJACENT TO BODIES OF WATER UNDER TIDAL INFLUENCES	YES	1984	12121	86792	98913
ADJACENT TO OPEN OCEAN WATERS	YES	1982	9421	86792	96213
OFFSHORE	YES	1977	B	B	B
ON BARRIER ISLAND	YES	1972	A	A	A
ON OPEN OCEAN ISLAND	NO				
ON ESTUARY/EMBAYMENT ISLAND	NO				
ON UNCLASSIFIED ISLAND	NO				

\*\*\*\*\*  
ACREAGE  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\* 0 PERCENT OF THE 1984 ACREAGE IS IN  
NONCOASTAL COUNTIES.

## INVENTORY OF FACILITIES

			BUDGET & PERSONNEL	
			EXPENDITURES	REVENUE
ARTIFICIAL REEFS	0	#	CAPITAL (\$)	OPERATING (\$)
FISHING PIERS	1	#	1984	3012200
BOAT RAMPS	1	#	1982	3266000
BOAT SLIPS	0	#	1977	2510700
BOAT DOCKS (WITHOUT SLIPS)	0	#	1972	816000
CAMPSITES (RV AND TENT)	1	#		
RECREATIONAL SHELLFISH BEDS	240	#		
HUNTING/GAME MANAGEMENT AREA	0	ACRES		
CONSERVATION/SCENIC AREA	0	ACRES		
BEACH	98913	LINEAR FT		
TRAILS	540000	MILES		
OUTDOOR SWIMMING POOLS	8	#		
PICNIC TABLES	0	#		
GOLF COURSES	500	#		
DRIVING RANGES	0	#		
OUTDOOR COURTS	0	#		
FIELD SPORT AREAS	0	#		
PARKING SPACES AT HISTORICAL/CULTURAL SITES	1	#		
PARKING SPACES AT ALL OTHER SITES	180	#		
	800	#		
			USER DAYS - ATTENDANCE	
			1984	5803400
			1982	3507400
			1977	2900000
			1972	1972

## MISSING INFORMATION CODES

- A = SITE DID NOT EXIST  
 B = RECORDS NOT KEPT ON THIS DATA ELEMENT  
 C = RECORDS TOO COSTLY TO RETRIEVE  
 D = AGENCY DID NOT RESPOND TO SURVEY  
 E = AGENCY LOST RECORDS  
 F = SATELLITE PARK DATA IN OTHER PARK  
 G = LATITUDE - LONGITUDE NOT FOUND
- \*\*\*\*\*
- STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT BRANCH  
 OCEAN ASSESSMENTS DIVISION  
 OFFICE OF OCEANOGRAPHY AND MARINE ASSESSMENTS  
 NATIONAL OCEANIC SERVICE  
 NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION  
 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 PHONE (301) 443-8843/8921
- \*\*\*\*\*

## List of Publications

Leeworthy, Vernon R., Norman F. Meade, Paula M. deNobel, and Richard Sacchi, 1987: National Inventory of public outdoor recreation facilities in coastal areas, South Carolina, Volume 1: Rockville, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 8pp.

Leeworthy, Vernon R., Norman F. Meade, Paula M. deNobel, and Richard Sacchi, 1987: National Inventory of public outdoor recreation facilities in coastal areas, South Carolina, Volume II: Appendices. Rockville, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Meade, Norman F., Thomas LaPointe and Robert C. Anderson, 1983: Multivariate analysis of worldwide tanker casualties. In Proceedings: 1983 Oil Spill Conference, American Petroleum Institute, Washington, D.C., 6pp.

Meade, Norman F. and Vernon R. Leeworthy, 1986: Public expenditures on outdoor recreation in the coastal areas of the USA. Rockville, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 18pp.

Ocean Assessments Division, 1983: Assessing the social costs of oil spills: The Amoco Cadiz case study. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 144pp.

Strategic Assessment Branch, 1984: Analysis of oil discharges from proposed tankering operation in eastern Gulf of Mexico. Rockville, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 16pp.

Strategic Assessment Branch, 1988: National estuarine inventory: Data Atlas, Volume 4, public recreation facilities in coastal areas. Rockville, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 156pp.

Yang, Edward J., Roger C. Dower, and Mark Menefee, 1984: The use of economic analysis in valuing natural resource damages, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 154pp.

NOAA COASTAL SERVICES CENTER LIBRARY



3 6668 00003 4217